The Perception of Library and Information Science Journals by LIS Education Deans and ARL Library Directors: A Replication of the Kohl–Davis Study

Thomas E. Nisonger and Charles H. Davis

Analyzing the collective opinion of presumed experts, often termed a perception study, is a frequently used approach for rating journals or evaluating education programs. Replicating the 1985 Kohl–Davis study, seventy-one library and information science (LIS) journals are ranked according to their mean rating on a 1 to 5 ordinal scale by deans of ALA-accredited education programs and by the directors of ARL libraries (surveyed during the summer of 2003). Comparison of the results with the 1985 study found considerable continuity in journal perceptions over the past two decades, but more so by directors than deans. A weak to moderate correlation was found between deans' ratings and *Journal Citation Reports* citation scores, whereas the correlations between directors' perceptions and citation data were weak to nonexistent. The findings confirm a hierarchy of prestige among LIS journals, but the hierarchical order differs somewhat between deans and directors.

Although, in theory, every research article should be judged on its own merits, the journal in which it is published often serves as a proxy indicator of research quality. The evaluation of scholarly journals is important for selection and cancellation decisions by librarians, the evaluation of faculty and librarians for promotion and tenure as well as annual performance reviews, manuscript submission decisions by authors, monitoring of their journals by editors and publishers, and familiarizing new doctoral students or outsiders (such as members of a university-wide promotion and tenure committee evaluating faculty from other departments) with a field's journals.

Thomas E. Nisonger is Professor and Charles H. Davis is a Senior Fellow, both in the School of Library and Information Science at Indiana University; e-mail: nisonge@indiana.edu and davisc@indiana.edu, respectively. All correspondence should be sent to Professor Nisonger. *The authors gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Rebecca Kennedy, an MLS student and graduate assistant in Indiana University's School of Library and Information Science (SLIS), who compiled the data; Yung-Rang Cheng, a Ph.D. student and adjunct faculty member in SLIS, who conducted the statistical analysis with SPSS; and Debora Shaw, Executive Associate Dean and Professor in SLIS, who provided valuable feedback on various drafts of the manuscript.*

Both journal rankings, which place a set of journals in hierarchical order according to some type of evaluative measure, and journal ratings, which calculate evaluative scores for a set of journals without placing them in explicit hierarchical order, can help evaluate the scholarly journals of a discipline. The two most frequently used journal ranking/rating criteria in library and information science (LIS) as well as other disciplines are citation data (such as impact factor or total citation count in the Institute for Scientific Information's *Journal Citation Reports*) and the perceptions of domain experts.

This research replicates an analysis and ranking of LIS journals based on the perceptions of LIS education program deans and directors of large research libraries, which was published in 1985 by David F. Kohl and Charles H. Davis.[1] The Kohl–Davis study, as is demonstrated in the literature review, served as a model for several subsequent perception-based rankings of LIS journals by various constituencies and was last replicated about a decade ago by Virgil L. P. Blake.[2]

The benefits and drawbacks of journal perception studies have been debated in the literature and briefly summarized by Thomas E. Nisonger.[3] Proponents argue that expert perception can reflect subtle nuances of journal value not readily captured by citation data or other objective measures and that perception rankings reflect the collective judgment of domain specialists whose knowledge of the field and its journals may reasonably be presumed. Critics of the perception approach contend that respondents may be biased, unfamiliar with the titles they are rating or have outdated perceptions, that important titles might have been omitted from the list for evaluation, and that the criteria on which journals are being rated may be vague or ill defined.

Literature Review

Nisonger identified 178 rankings or ratings of LIS journals published between 1952 and 1997.[4] After citation-based rankings (nine different citation methods were used), perception studies (25 contained in 12 published studies) were the most frequently employed approach. Other ranking methods included productivity (i.e., the number of articles contributed to an indexing or abstracting database) and readership.

In fact, the earliest LIS journal evaluations identified in this investigation used the perception method. More than half a century ago in 1952, Alice I. Bryan, as part of the Public Library Inquiry survey, rated a list of eight journals based on the percentage of 1,837 professional librarians and 461 subprofessionals who judged the title "had made very helpful contributions towards the effectiveness of their library work during the past year."[5] Mary Lee Bundy's survey of public library directors asked them to name published articles considered "particularly good" and regular columns or features they "like especially."[6] She then listed fourteen journals according to the number of times their articles were mentioned and twelve titles in order of the times their columns or features were written on the survey forms. C. W. Hanson and Patricia Tilbury asked participants at the 1962 Aslib conference in the United Kingdom to list the three journals they "most look forward to seeing" and ranked the top twenty-five by tabulating their responses.[7] In order to generate a citation pool for a document delivery test, Rudolf Jacob Penner asked the deans of the seven Canadian LIS education programs to list the twenty journals they deemed "most important for research and education" in the field and then ranked twenty-four titles based on the number of times mentioned.[8]

Some journal rankings or ratings have been compiled from the subjective judgment of faculty in a single LIS education program. Charles T. Meadow and Mary Ann Zaborowski presented a list of journals to four Drexel University LIS faculty and in 1979 published a ranking of the top ten journals according to the number of votes received.[9] Robert M. Hayes

published ratings for 140 journals based on the number of UCLA LIS faculty who identified them as "central" or "peripheral" to their specialties.[10]

Kohl and Davis, whose methodology was modeled on evaluations of LIS education programs by Herbert S.White[11 12 13] surveyed the sixty-six deans of schools/institutions with ALA-accredited library programs and the eighty-five directors of ARL institutions in the fall of 1982 to determine if there were a perceived "hierarchy of prestige" among the field's journals.[14] Respondents were asked to rate a list of thirty-one journals, culled from a core journal listing by Jesse H. Shera,[15] on a 1 to 5 ordinal scale concerning "how important publication in that journal was for the consideration of promotion and tenure at their institution" and to indicate in no particular order the five most prestigious journals, termed the "top five" method.[16]

The Kohl–Davis methodology served as a model for several subsequent journal rankings. Renee Tjoumas asked public library directors to rate a list of fifty-six periodicals on a 1 to 5 ordinal scale concerning their "usefulness for the performance of work-related duties."[17] Virgil L. Blake compared the ratings of fifty-five journals by LIS faculty specializing in school media with those of district-level school library media coordinators.[18] Tjoumas and Blake then compared the latter's journal ratings by LIS school media faculty with a new set of evaluations by faculty specializing in public librarianship.[19] Finally, Blake replicated the Kohl–Davis methodology by surveying in 1992 the deans of schools with ALA-accredited LIS education programs and the directors of ARL libraries, asking them to rate a list of fifty-seven journals.[20] Note that the original Kohl–Davis article and the later studies using its methodology found, among other things, that a hierarchy of journal prestige does indeed exist and that for many journals perceptions of their prestige vary among different stakeholder groups and longitudinally over time.

The most recent perception ranking of LIS journals was published in 1997 by E. E. Nkereuwem.[21] Nigerian academic librarians rated a list of journals on a 0 to 10 scale according to the "quality" of their articles. Twenty-six journals were ranked based on "journal impact," calculated by multiplication of the mean rating by the proportion of respondents sufficiently familiar with the journal to rate it plus addition of the mean rating to the result.

Journal rankings based on the perceptions of subject experts (variously termed "perception," "prestige," or "subjective" studies) have been compiled in numerous social science disciplines and professional fields other than library and information science. Examples include political science by Michael W. Giles, Francie Mizell, and David Patterson,[22] sociology by Norval D. Glenn,[23] geography by David Lee and Arthur Evans,[24] criminal justice by David Shichor, Robert M. O'Brien, and David L. Decker,[25] human development by J. Craig Peery and Gerald R. Adams,[26] economics by Jean-Louis Malouin and J.-Francois Outreville,[27] behavioral aspects of management by Marian M. Extejt and Jonathan E. Smith,[28] marketing by Robert H. Luke and E. Reed Doke,[29] real estate by Joe Albert and P. R. Chandy,[30] business ethics by Andrew C. Wicks and Robbin Derry,[31] accounting by Lawrence D. Brown and Ronald J. Huefner,[32] and social work by Ram A. Cnaan, Richard K. Caputo, and Yochi Shmuely.[33] Typically, these studies rank a list of journals through a 4-, 5-, or 10-point quality scale.

In addition to rating journals per se, these studies have investigated such questions as the correspondence between citation and perception rankings, the longitudinal stability of perception rankings, and the extent to which specialists give higher ratings to journals in their own areas.

Methodology

The methods Kohl and Davis used in the original study were replicated with an expanded set of journal titles. In early July,

2003, questionnaires were mailed to the fifty-six deans, directors, or department chairs of schools with ALA-accredited LIS education programs (identified through the ALA Web site) and the directors of the 120 ARL libraries (member institutions were determined through the ARL Web site and their directors identified through the member library Web sites directly linked to the ARL Web site). A second questionnaire was sent in late September to those who did not respond to the first mailing.[34]

Deans of ALA-accredited LIS education programs and ARL library directors were selected to replicate the Kohl–Davis study. Moreover, these populations may reasonably be assumed to be familiar with the quality of various LIS journals as well as the promotion and tenure policies at their institutions.

There were two parts to the survey instrument. Part one asked respondents to rate a list of seventy-one journals on a 1 (low) to 5 (high) ordinal scale according to their perception of "how important publication in each journal is for promotion and tenure at your institution." Respondents were instructed not to rate (i.e., to indicate NF [not familiar]) for those titles "which you do not have enough familiarity with to rate." They also were given the opportunity to suggest additional titles not on the original list that they believed should have been included.

The list of seventy-one journals included the titles in the original Kohl–Davis study, if still active, and those covered in the "information and library science" subject category in the 2001 *Journal Citation Reports* (the most current edition available when the questionnaire was designed in the early summer of 2003). A number of titles were added to give representation to all-electronic journals (e.g., *First Monday* and *D-Lib Magazine)* and topics that had emerged since the initial Kohl–Davis study (e.g., *Internet Research*). In contrast to the Kohl–Davis study, Canadian journals were included on the list if they met these criteria. In applying these criteria, a few likely journals (e.g., *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*) were inevitably omitted from the list.

Ulrich's Periodicals Directory and Google Web searches were used to verify that all seventy-one titles were still active and listed under the currently correct title. Of the thirty-one titles in the first Kohl–Davis study, seventeen were still being published under the same title. The others had either ceased publication, such as *Wilson Library Bulletin*, *Drexel Library Quarterly,* and the *Library of Congress Quarterly Journal* or changed names. For example, *Journal of Library History, Philosophy, & Comparative Librarianship* became *Libraries & Culture* and *RQ* changed to *Reference & User Services Quarterly*. In some cases, the title changes were relatively minor, such as from the *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* to the *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* (*JASIST*). In instances of recent name changes, the former title also was indicated on the questionnaire to avoid confusion.

In part two of the survey, the ARL library directors and LIS education program heads were asked to list, in no particular order, the five most prestigious journals "to have published in for promotion and tenure purposes at your institution." No further instructions were given, so respondents were free to list titles on the original list, titles not so listed, or a combination of the two categories. Kohl and Davis as well as other investigators have referred to this technique as the "top five method."

It is the authors' understanding that all schools with ALA-accredited programs currently have a promotion and tenure system in place. The questionnaire sent to directors of ARL libraries differed slightly from that mailed to the heads of LIS education programs, as it asked whether their institution had promotion and tenure systems and instructed respondents whose institutions lacked these policies to rate the seventy-one titles and list the top five "according to the prestige asso-

ciated with publishing in it." Finally, the questionnaires to both groups concluded with an open-ended question asking for general comments.

This investigation's analysis is based on the mean rating of each journal by LIS deans and the mean ratings by library directors. Two methods were used to calculate the mean ratings. In the first method, used in the Kohl–Davis study and by Blake, blank responses were counted as zero, predicated on the assumption that a respondent's nonfamiliarity with a title reflected negatively on its status. In the second method, blank responses were simply disregarded so that journals highly rated by smaller numbers of respondents would not be disadvantaged.

Results

After a second mailing in September 2003, thirty-seven usable responses from LIS deans (a 66.1% response rate) and fifty-six usable responses from library directors (a 46.7% rate) had been received by the end of December 2003, for a 52.8 percent overall response rate. These rates are somewhat lower than the 71.1 percent response rate from deans and the 50.6 percent rate from directors in the Kohl–Davis study [35] and the 75.8 and 59 percent response rates from deans and directors respectively in Blake.[36] Yet, this investigation's overall response rate was higher than those in numerous perception-based journal rankings in LIS and other disciplines, such as 22.2 percent in Bundy,[37] 33 percent in Hanson and Tilbury,[38] 42 percent in Cnaan, Caputo, and Shmuely,[39] 49.3 percent in Brown and Huefner,[40] and 25.5 percent in Wicks and Derry.[41]

Mean Ratings of the Journals

Table 1 displays the seventy-one titles in rank order according to their mean rating by ARL directors and then by LIS education deans, with "not familiar" or blank responses counted as 0. Table 2 follows the identical format, but the NF or blank responses were disregarded in calculating each journal's mean rating.

There was a .735 correlation in the directors' ratings by the two methods and .737 for the deans. However, some journal rankings changed between the two tables. In the deans' ratings, *Scientometrics* increases from 43rd to 7th and *MIS Quarterly* from a three-way tie for 45th to 10th from table 1 to table 2, reflecting the fact that many respondents are unfamiliar with these titles, but those who are familiar with them rate them highly. In contrast, some well-known titles receiving midlevel ratings from a large proportion of the respondents decrease in rank from table 1 (where they are not penalized by 0s from nonraters) to table 2. For instance, in the directors' ratings, *American Libraries* falls from 18th to 66th and *Library Journal* declines from tied for 11th to 45th.

The results are mixed regarding all-electronic journals. Some titles did not fare especially well. For example, *Cybermetrics,* ranked 70th, three-way tie for 46th (throughout this article, a journal's rank in table 1 is reported first, followed by the rank in table 2 with tied positions so indicated) by directors and 70th, 56th (tied) by deans, and *First Monday* ranked 47th, 57th by directors and 52th, 59th by deans. Other all-electronic titles made quite respectable showings in some rankings. *School Library Media Research* ranked 16th, 16th by deans, but its 60th, 68th ranking by directors is no surprise given its focus on school libraries. *D-Lib Magazine* placed in position 22 in table 1's directors' rankings, but less impressive is its three-way tie for 46 by directors in table 2 and the 57th, 54th rankings by deans. In summary, firm conclusions regarding scholarly acceptance of electronic journals cannot be reached due to the small sample size. One should also note that eighteen directors listed the all-electronic journal *Libres* (second only to *Portal: Libraries and the Academy)* as among those that should have been included on the list of seventy-one titles. (See subsequent subsection on additionally suggested titles.)

Exactly half (28 of 56) of the responding ARL directors reported their library had

TABLE 1
Average Rating of Journal Prestige in Terms of Value for Tenure and Promotion by Directors and Deans:
"Not familiar" and blank responses are counted as 0.

ARL Directors			LIS Deans		
Rank	**Journal Title**	**Mean Rating**	**Rank**	**Journal Title**	**Mean Rating**
1	College & Research Libraries	4.46	1	JASIST	4.41
2	Library Trends	4.41	1	Library Quarterly	4.41
3	Journal of Academic Librarianship	4.39	3	ARIST	3.97
4	Library Quarterly	4.25	3	Library & Information Science Research	3.97
5	Reference & User Services Quarterly	4.04	5	Journal of Documentation	3.81
6	Library Resources & Technical Services	3.86	6	Library Trends	3.62
7	JASIST	3.82	7	Journal of Academic Librarianship	3.49
8	ARIST	3.70	7	Information Processing & Management	3.49
9	Library Coll. Acq. & Tech. Services	3.57	9	ASIST Proceedings	3.46
10	Information Technology & Libraries	3.52	10	Reference & User Services Quarterly	3.43
11	Collection Management	3.39	11	College & Research Libraries	3.41
11	Library Journal	3.39	12	J. Education for Library & Info. Science	3.30
13	Reference Services Review	3.27	13	Libraries & Culture	3.24
14	Government Information Quarterly	3.09	14	Journal of the Medical Library Association	3.19
15	Journal of the Medical Library Association	3.04	15	Library Resources & Technical Services	3.11
16	Aslib Proceedings	2.91	16	School Library Media Research	3.08
17	Libri	2.84	17	Journal of Information Science	2.95
18	American Libraries	2.82	17	Libri	2.95
19	Information Outlook	2.79	19	J. Amer. Medical Informatics Association	2.92
20	Journal of Documentation	2.73	20	School Library Journal	2.81

TABLE 1
Average Rating of Journal Prestige in Terms of Value for Tenure and Promotion by Directors and Deans:
"Not familiar" and blank responses are counted as 0.

ARL Directors			LIS Deans		
Rank	**Journal Title**	**Mean Rating**	**Rank**	**Journal Title**	**Mean Rating**
20	Library & Information Science Research	2.73	21	Aslib Proceedings	2.78
22	D-Lib Magazine	2.71	22	Canadian J. Info. & Library Science	2.73
23	J. Education for Library & Info. Science	2.66	23	Information Research	2.70
24	Libraries & Culture	2.57	23	Public Libraries	2.70
25	Journal of Government Information	2.52	25	Government Information Quarterly	2.68
26	Journal of Information Science	2.38	25	Information Technology & Libraries	2.68
26	Journal of Scholarly Publishing	2.38	27	Journal of Scholarly Publishing	2.49
28	J. Librarianship & Information Science	2.34	28	Information Outlook	2.46
29	Online	2.30	29	J. Librarianship & Information Science	2.41
30	Interlending & Document Supply	2.18	30	Journal of Government Information	2.38
30	Law Library Journal	2.18	30	Law Library Journal	2.38
32	Microform & Imaging Review	2.14	30	Reference Services Review	2.38
33	ASIST Proceedings	2.11	33	Online Information Review	2.24
34	Information & Management	2.05	34	Library Journal	2.19
35	Canadian J. Info. & Library Science	2.02	35	Collection Management	2.16
35	Econtent	2.02	36	The Information Society	2.14
35	Journal of Information Technology	2.02	36	Journal of Information Ethics	2.14
38	Library & Information Science	2.00	38	International J. Information Management	2.11
39	Harvard Library Bulletin	1.86	39	Library Coll. Acq. & Tech. Services	2.08
39	International J. Information Management	1.86	40	Library & Information Science	2.05

TABLE 1
Average Rating of Journal Prestige in Terms of Value for Tenure and Promotion by Directors and Deans:
"Not familiar" and blank responses are counted as 0.

ARL Directors			LIS Deans		
Rank	**Journal Title**	**Mean Rating**	**Rank**	**Journal Title**	**Mean Rating**
41	Information Processing & Management	1.77	40	Online	2.05
42	Journal of Management Information Systems	1.75	42	Journal of Management Information Systems	2.00
43	Journal of Information Ethics	1.73	43	Scientometrics	1.97
44	J. Amer. Medical Informatics Association	1.71	44	Information & Management	1.89
45	School Library Journal	1.68	45	Journal of Information Technology	1.86
46	Online Information Review	1.64	45	Knowledge Organization	1.86
47	First Monday	1.61	45	MIS Quarterly	1.86
48	Information Research	1.57	48	Information Systems Research	1.84
48	International Information & Library Review	1.57	49	American Libraries	1.78
48	Scientist	1.57	49	Internet Research	1.78
51	International J. Geographical Info. Science	1.52	51	International Information & Library Review	1.70
51	Social Science Information	1.52	52	First Monday	1.62
53	Public Libraries	1.50	53	Journal of Health Communication	1.58
54	Information Systems Research	1.48	54	Microform & Imaging Review	1.57
54	International Journal of Legal Information	1.48	55	Harvard Library Bulletin	1.46
56	Electronic Library	1.45	55	Program: Electronic Library & Info. Systems	1.46
57	The Information Society	1.41	57	D-Lib Magazine	1.43
58	Internet Research	1.39	58	Electronic Library	1.32
58	Social Science Computer Review	1.39	58	International Journal of Legal Information	1.32
60	School Library Media Research	1.38	60	Econtent	1.27

TABLE 1
Average Rating of Journal Prestige in Terms of Value for Tenure and Promotion by Directors and Deans:
"Not familiar" and blank responses are counted as 0.

ARL Directors			LIS Deans		
Rank	**Journal Title**	**Mean Rating**	**Rank**	**Journal Title**	**Mean Rating**
61	Information Systems Journal	1.34	60	Information Systems Journal	1.27
62	Knowledge & Organization	1.32	60	Telecommunications Policy	1.27
63	MIS Quarterly	1.29	63	Interlending & Document Supply	1.19
64	Telecommunications Policy	1.27	63	Social Science Information	1.19
65	Zeitschrift B. B.	1.16	65	Zeitschrift B. B.	1.14
66	Journal of Health Communication	1.11	66	Scientist	0.89
67	Restaurator	0.96	67	Social Science Computer Review	0.86
68	Scientometrics	0.91	68	International J. Geographical Info. Science	0.78
69	Program: Electronic Library & Info. Systems	0.89	69	Restaurator	0.62
70	Cybermetrics	0.79	70	Cybermetrics	0.59
71	NFD Info. Wissenschaft und Praxis	0.45	71	NFD Info. Wissenschaft und Praxis	0.41

a tenure system. The ratings by the two categories (directors in libraries with a tenure system and libraries without tenure) were strongly correlated, .925 when blank responses are counted as 0 and .804 when they are disregarded. Thus, we conclude further analysis regarding the possible influence of a tenure system on library director journal perceptions is unnecessary.

Differences between Deans' and Directors' Ratings and Rankings

T-tests indicated that the mean ratings by deans and directors differed at the .05 significance level for twenty-six journals, 36.6 percent of the seventy-one listed, when nonrated titles are counted as 0, and for twenty-nine titles, 40.8 percent of those listed, when nonrated journals are disregarded.[42] For the names of these journals, see tables 3 and 4. Among the titles on both lists are such well-known publications as *American Libraries*, *Library Journal*, *College & Research Libraries*, *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, and *Information Processing & Management*. In the 1985 Kohl–Davis study, deans and directors differed on eleven of thirty-one titles (35.5%),[43] eight of which are listed in table 3 and nine in table 4 (with *School Library Media Research* counted as equivalent to its earlier title *School Library Media Quarterly*).

Although a purist might argue that mean scores are of more statistical impor-

TABLE 2
Average Rating of Journal Prestige in Terms of Value for Tenure and Promotion by Directors and Deans:
"Not familiar" and blank responses are not considered.

ARL Directors			LIS Deans		
Rank	**Journal Title**	**Mean Rating**	**Rank**	**Journal Title**	**Mean Rating**
1	College & Research Libraries (53)	4.72	1	JASIST (35)	4.66
2	Library Trends (55)	4.49	2	Library Quarterly (36)	4.53
3	JASIST (48)	4.46	3	Information Processing & Management (30)	4.30
4	Journal of Academic Librarianship (55)	4.39	4	Library & Info. Science Research (35)	4.20
5	Reference & User Services Quarterly (52)	4.35	5	Journal of Documentation (34)	4.15
6	Library Quarterly (55)	4.33	6	ARIST (36)	4.08
7	Information Technology & Libraries (47)	4.19	7	Scientometrics (18)	4.06
8	Journal of the Medical Lib. Association (41)	4.15	8	Library Trends (34)	3.94
8	Library Resources & Technical Services (52)	4.15	9	J. Amer. Medical Informatics Assoc. (28)	3.86
10	Reference Services Review (45)	4.07	10	MIS Quarterly (18)	3.83
11	ARIST (51)	4.06	11	Libraries & Culture (32)	3.75
12	Library Coll. Acq. & Tech. Services (50)	4.00	12	College & Research Libraries (34)	3.71
13	Library & Information Science Research (39)	3.92	12	Lib. Resources & Technical Services (31)	3.71
14	Journal of Scholarly Publishing (34)	3.91	14	Information Research (27)	3.70
15	Libraries & Culture (37)	3.89	15	Journal of Academic Librarianship (35)	3.69
16	J. Amer. Medical Informatics Assoc. (25)	3.84	16	School Library Media Research (31)	3.68
17	Journal of Documentation (40)	3.83	17	Reference & User Services Quarterly (35)	3.63
18	Journal of Information Science (35)	3.80	18	Telecommunications Policy (13)	3.62
19	Information Systems Research (22)	3.77	19	The Information Society (22)	3.59
19	Journal of Information Technology (30)	3.77	20	Information Systems Research (19)	3.58

TABLE 2
Average Rating of Journal Prestige in Terms of Value for Tenure and Promotion by Directors and Deans:
"Not familiar" and blank responses are not considered.

ARL Directors			LIS Deans		
Rank	**Journal Title**	**Mean Rating**	**Rank**	**Journal Title**	**Mean Rating**
21	J. Librarianship & Information Science (35)	3.74	20	Journal of the Medical Lib. Association (33)	3.58
22	Collection Management (51)	3.73	22	ASIST Proceedings (36)	3.56
23	International J.Geographical Info. Sci. (23)	3.70	23	Journal of Scholarly Publishing (26)	3.54
23	Law Library Journal (33)	3.70	24	Journal of Information Science (31)	3.52
23	Libri (43)	3.70	24	J. Management Information Systems (21)	3.52
26	Government Information Quarterly (47)	3.68	26	Zeitschrift B. B. (12)	3.50
27	Information Processing & Management (27)	3.67	27	Knowledge Organization (20)	3.45
28	Journal of Government Information (39)	3.62	28	J. Education for Lib. & Info. Science (36)	3.39
29	Library & Information Science (31)	3.61	29	J. Librarianship & Information Science (27)	3.30
30	Information Systems Journal (21)	3.57	29	Library & Information Science (23)	3.30
31	J. Education for Library & Info. Science (42)	3.55	31	Journal of Information Technology (21)	3.29
31	Social Science Computer Review (22)	3.55	32	Library Coll. Acq. & Tech. Services (24)	3.21
33	Aslib Proceedings (46)	3.54	32	Libri (34)	3.21
34	Information Research (25)	3.52	34	Program: Electronic Lib.& Info. Systs. (17)	3.18
34	International Information & Lib. Review (25)	3.52	35	Law Library Journal (28)	3.14
34	Knowledge Organization (21)	3.52	35	Social Science Information (14)	3.14
34	Scientist (25)	3.52	37	Aslib Proceedings (33)	3.12
38	Information & Management (33)	3.48	37	International J. Info. Management (25)	3.12
39	Information Outlook (45)	3.47	37	International J. of Legal Information (16)	3.12

TABLE 2
Average Rating of Journal Prestige in Terms of Value for Tenure and Promotion by Directors and Deans:
"Not familiar" and blank responses are not considered.

ARL Directors			LIS Deans		
Rank	**Journal Title**	**Mean Rating**	**Rank**	**Journal Title**	**Mean Rating**
39	International J. Information Management (30)	3.47	40	Government Information Quarterly (32)	3.09
41	Journal of Information Ethics (28)	3.46	40	Information Technology & Libraries (32)	3.09
42	Journal of Health Communication (18)	3.44	42	Canadian J. Info. & Library Science (33)	3.06
43	The Information Society (23)	3.43	43	Information & Management (23)	3.04
44	Social Science Information (25)	3.40	43	Journal of Information Ethics (26)	3.04
45	Library Journal (53)	3.39	45	Journal of Government Information (29)	3.03
46	Cybermetrics (13)	3.38	45	Public Libraries (33)	3.03
46	D-Lib Magazine (45)	3.38	45	Reference Services Review (29)	3.03
46	J. Management Information Systems (29)	3.38	48	Internet Research (22)	3.00
49	International J. of Legal Information (25)	3.32	49	School Library Journal (35)	2.97
50	Online (39)	3.31	50	Information Systems Journal (16)	2.94
51	Interlending & Document Supply (37)	3.30	51	Journal of Health Communication (20)	2.93
52	ASIST Proceedings (36)	3.28	52	Social Science Computer Review (11)	2.91
53	Internet Research (24)	3.25	53	Collection Management (28)	2.86
54	Canadian J. Info. & Library Science (35)	3.23	54	D-Lib Magazine (19)	2.79
54	Econtent (35)	3.23	55	Information Outlook (33)	2.76
54	Telecommunications Policy (22)	3.23	56	Cybermetrics (8)	2.75
57	First Monday (28)	3.21	56	Scientist (12)	2.75
58	Scientometrics (16)	3.19	58	International Info. & Lib. Review (23)	2.74
59	Restaurator (17)	3.18	59	First Monday (22)	2.73
60	MIS Quarterly (23)	3.13	60	Online (28)	2.71

TABLE 2
Average Rating of Journal Prestige in Terms of Value for Tenure and Promotion by Directors and Deans:
"Not familiar" and blank responses are not considered.

ARL Directors			LIS Deans		
Rank	**Journal Title**	**Mean Rating**	**Rank**	**Journal Title**	**Mean Rating**
61	Electronic Library (26)	3.12	61	Online Information Review (31)	2.68
62	Zeitschrift B. B. (21)	3.10	62	Electronic Library (20)	2.45
63	Microform & Imaging Review (40)	3.00	63	International J. Geographical Info. Sci. (12)	2.42
64	Online Information Review (31)	2.97	63	Microform & Imaging Review (24)	2.42
65	Program: Electronic Lib.& Info. Systems (17)	2.94	65	Interlending & Document Supply (19)	2.32
66	American Libraries ((55)	2.87	66	Library Journal (35)	2.31
67	Harvard Library Bulletin (37)	2.81	67	Restaurator (10)	2.30
68	School Library Media Research (33)	2.33	68	Econtent (21)	2.24
69	School Library Journal (41)	2.29	69	NFD Info. Wissenschaft und Praxis (7)	2.14
70	NFD Info. Wissenschaft und Praxis (11)	2.27	70	Harvard Library Bulletin (26)	2.08
70	Public Libraries (37)	2.27	71	American Libraries (35)	1.89

The number of respondents who rated the title (i.e., did not have blank or NF responses), is given in parentheses.

tance than ranking position, the latter can nevertheless illustrate relative differences in perceptions between the two groups. In table 1, only one journal, *Library Quarterly*, ranks among the five highest in both the deans' and directors' ratings, but six of the top ten overlap between the two groups: *Library Trends*, *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *Library Quarterly*, *Reference & Users Services Quarterly, JASIST*, and the *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology* (*ARIST*). In table 2, only *JASIST* ranks in both groups' top five and only three titles, *JASIST*, *Library Trends*, and *Library Quarterly*, overlap in the top ten.

Deans, not unexpectedly, tended to rate information science journals higher than did directors. For example, they ranked *Scientometrics* 43rd, 7th compared to 68th, 58th by directors and *Information Processing & Management* 7th (tied), 3rd contrasted to 41st, 27th by directors It is no surprise that directors rated practitioner-oriented journals higher than did deans. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services* was ranked 9th, 12th by directors contrasted to 39th, 32nd (tied) by deans, whereas *Information Technology & Libraries* was ranked 10th, 7th by directors and 25th (tied), 40th (tied) by deans.

Overall, there was a .700 correlation between deans' and directors' ratings

when blank responses are counted as 0 (table 1). This is somewhat lower than the .791 correlation in the first Kohl–Davis (1985) study, which calculated nonresponses as 0s, suggesting a longitudinal decline in the agreement between these two constituencies. With blank responses disregarded (table 2), the correlation between directors' and deans' ratings decreases to .545, demonstrating there is less agreement when journal familiarity is eliminated as a variable. (A longitudinal comparison with the earlier investigation is impossible because it did not use this method of calculating mean scores.)

TABLE 3
Journals Whose Ratings by Directors and Deans Differed Significantly: "Not familiar" and blank responses are counted as 0.

Journals	Directors' Rating	Deans' Rating	Significance Level
American Libraries	2.82	1.78	<.01
Canadian Journal of Information & Library Science	2.02	2.73	.044
Collection Management	3.39	2.16	<.01
College & Research Libraries	4.46	3.41	<.01
D-Lib Magazine	2.71	1.43	.001
Econtent	2.02	1.27	.030
Information Processing & Management	1.77	3.49	<.01
Information Research	1.57	2.70	.006
Information Technology & Libraries	3.52	2.68	.013
Interlending & Document Supply	2.18	1.19	.005
International Journal of Geographical Info. Science	1.52	0.78	.050
Journal of Academic Librarianship	4.39	3.49	<.01
Journal of Documentation	2.73	3.81	.005
Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association	1.71	2.92	.005
Library & Information Science Research	2.73	3.97	.002
Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services	3.57	2.08	<.01
Library Journal	3.39	2.19	<.01
Library Resources & Technical Services	3.86	3.11	.020
Library Trends	4.41	3.62	.004
ASIST Proceedings	2.11	3.46	<.01
Public Libraries	1.50	2.70	<.01
Reference & User Services Quarterly	4.04	3.43	.031
Reference Services Review	3.27	2.38	.014
School Library Journal	1.68	2.81	<.01
School Library Media Research	1.38	3.08	<.01
Scientometrics	0.91	1.97	.008

TABLE 4
Journals Whose Ratings by Directors and Deans Differed Significantly: "Not familiar" and blank responses are not considered.

Journals	Directors' Rating	Deans' Rating	Significance Level
American Libraries	2.87	1.89	<.01
Collection Management	3.73	2.86	<.01
College & Research Libraries	4.72	3.71	<.01
Econtent	3.23	2.24	.01
Electronic Library	3.12	2.45	.049
Government Information Quarterly	3.68	3.09	.021
Harvard Library Bulletin	2.81	2.08	.011
Information Outlook	3.47	2.76	.001
Information Processing & Management	3.67	4.30	.018
Information Technology & Libraries	4.19	3.09	<.01
Interlending & Document Supply	3.30	2.32	<.01
International Information & Library Review	3.52	2.74	.021
International Journal of Geographical Info. Science	3.70	2.42	.004
Journal of Academic Librarianship	4.39	3.69	.001
Journal of Government Information	3.62	3.03	.017
Journal of the Medical Library Association	4.15	3.58	.021
Law Library Journal	3.70	3.14	.031
Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services	4.00	3.21	.003
Library Journal	3.39	2.31	<.01
Library Resources & Technical Services	4.15	3.71	.040
Library Trends	4.49	3.94	.011
Microform & Imaging Review	3.00	2.42	.013
Online	3.31	2.71	.007
Public Libraries	2.27	3.03	.008
Reference & User Services Quarterly	4.35	3.63	<.01
Reference Services Review	4.07	3.03	<.01
School Library Journal	2.29	2.97	.011
School Library Media Research	2.33	3.68	<.01
Scientometrics	3.19	4.06	.038

Internal Consensus among Deans and among Directors

In order to examine the consensus among respondents, the two most frequently mentioned rating levels were summed and divided by the total number of responses. For illustration, thirty-three of thirty-seven deans rated *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* as 4th or 5th, equaling an internal consensus of 89.3 percent. This technique, termed a "heuristic approach,"

TABLE 5
Degree of Internal Consensus by ARL Library Directors in Journal Ratings: "Not familiar" and blank responses are counted as 0.

Journal Title	Top Adjacent Totals[1]	Percentage of Total	Standard Deviation
Journal of Academic Librarianship	50 (4,5)	89.3	0.846
Library Trends	50 (4,5)	89.3	1.023
College & Research Libraries	49 (4,5)	87.5	1.250
NFD Information—Wissenschaft und Praxis	49 (0,1)	87.5	1.043
Library Quarterly	48 (4,5)	85.7	1.116
Cybermetrics	44 (0,1)	78.6	1.522
Journal of the American Society for Info. Science & Technology	44 (4,5)	78.6	1.759
Reference & User Services Quarterly	43 (4,5)	76.8	1.348
Restaurator	43 (0,1)	76.8	1.695
Scientometrics	42 (0,1)	75.0	1.587
Library Resources & Technical Services	40 (4,5)	71.4	1.394
Program: Electronic Library & Information Systems	40 (0,1)	71.4	1.473
Zeitschrift fur Bibliothekswesen und Bibliographie	39 (0,1)	69.6	1.735
ARIST	38 (4,5)	67.9	1.451
Information Technology & Libraries	38 (4,5)	67.9	1.716
Journal of Health Communication	38 (0,1)	67.9	1.713
Collection Management	37 (3,4)	66.1	1.358
Information Outlook	36 (3,4)	64.3	1.569
Information Systems Journal	35 (0,1)	62.5	1.842
Knowledge Organization	35 (0,1)	62.5	1.790
Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services	35 (4,5)	62.5	1.605
Telecommunications Policy	35 (0,1)	62.5	1.711
The Information Society	34 (0,1)	60.7	1.827
Information Systems Research	34 (0,1)	60.7	1.935
MIS Quarterly	34 (0,1)	60.7	1.724
School Library Media Research	34 (0,1)	60.7	1.496
Social Science Computer Review	34 (0,1)	60.1	1.836
Electronic Library	33 (0,1)	58.9	1.768
International Journal of Geographical Information Science	33 (0,1)	58.9	1.945
Public Libraries	33 (0,1)	58.9	1.489
International Information & Library Review	32 (0,1)	57.1	1.915

TABLE 5
Degree of Internal Consensus by ARL Library Directors in Journal Ratings: "Not familiar" and blank responses are counted as 0.

Journal Title	Top Adjacent Totals[1]	Percentage of Total	Standard Deviation
International Journal of Legal Information	32 (0,1)	57.1	1.799
Internet Research	32 (0,1)	57.1	1.723
Reference Services Review	32 (4,5)	57.1	1.804
First Monday	31 (0,1)	55.4	1.836
Information Research	31 (0,1)	55.4	1.877
Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association	31 (0,1)	55.4	2.033
Journal of the Medical Library Association	31 (4,5)	55.4	2.036
Library Journal	31 (4,5)	55.4	1.216
Scientist	31 (0,1)	55.4	1.925
Social Science Information	31 (0,1)	55.4	1.809
Aslib Proceedings	30 (3,4)	53.6	1.676
Online	30 (3,4)	53.6	1.705
American Libraries	29 (2,3)	51.8	1.252
Information Processing & Management	29 (0,1)	51.8	1.991
Library & Information Science Research	29 (4,5)	51.8	1.968
Government Information Quarterly	28 (3,4)	50.0	1.676
Interlending & Document Supply	28 (3,4)	50.0	1.759
Journal of Information Ethics	28 (0,1)	50.0	1.921
Journal of Documentation	27 (3,4)	48.2	1.921
Journal of Government Information	27 (3,4)	48.2	1.849
Journal of Management Information Systems	27 (0,1)	48.2	1.832
Information & Management	27 (3,4)	48.2	1.833
Library & Information Science	27 (3,4)	48.2	1.888
Microform & Imaging Review	27 (3,4)	48.2	1.577
Online Information Review	27 (0,1)	48.2	1.678
School Library Journal	27 (0,1)	48.2	1.390
Econtent	26 (3,4)	46.4	1.732
Harvard Library Bulletin	26 (0,1)	46.4	1.667
International Journal of Information Management	26 (0,1)	46.4	1.843
Journal of Information Technology	26 (0,1)	46.4	1.977
Journal of Scholarly Publishing	26 (4,5)	46.4	2.068
Libraries & Culture	26 (3,4)	46.6	1.980
Journal of Education for Library & Information Science	25 (3,4)	44.6	1.852

TABLE 5
Degree of Internal Consensus by ARL Library Directors in Journal Ratings: "Not familiar" and blank responses are counted as 0.

Journal Title	Top Adjacent Totals[1]	Percentage of Total	Standard Deviation
Journal of Information Science	25 (3,4)	44.6	1.978
Libri	25 (3,4)	44.6	1.837
Canadian Journal of Information & Library Science	24(0,1)	42.9	1.804
D-Lib Magazine	24 (3,4)	42.9	1.755
Journal of Librarianship & Information Science	24 (3,4)	42.9	1.966
Law Library Journal	23 (0,1)	41.1	1.974
ASIST Proceedings	23 (0,1)	41.1	1.836

[1]The number of responses in the two adjacent rating categories (0 through 5) receiving the highest number of ratings with the two categories indicated in parentheses

rather than standard deviation was used in Kohl and Davis as a measure of consensus because of its "intuitive clarity" and the fact that it is not skewed by extreme scores. They considered internal consensus to exist for any title with a score of 50.0 percent or higher.[44]

The internal consensus among the ARL directors is presented in table 5, calculated when blank responses count 0, and in table 6, calculated with blank responses disregarded. Both tables list the journals in descending order beginning with the highest degree of consensus. Tables 7 and 8 follow the same format for analyzing internal consensus in the deans' ratings.

To further illustrate the calculation of the internal consensus scores (and the different calculation methods for tables 5 and 6 contrasted with tables 7 and 8), let us examine the directors' ratings for *Cybermetrics:*

Rated as 0 (i.e., did not rate) = 43
Rated as 1 = 1
Rated as 2 = 0
Rated as 3 = 7
Rated as 4 = 3
Rated as 5 = 2

For table 5, which considers nonrating responses as 0, the two adjacent categories with the largest number of ratings are 0 (43 responses) and 1 (1 response) for a total of forty-four out of the fifty-six directors, the internal consensus is 78.6 percent. In table 6, the forty-three nonrating responses are disregarded. Therefore, the two adjacent categories with the most frequent number of responses are 3 (7 responses) and 4 (3) responses for a total of 10. *Cybermetrics*' internal consensus in table 6 is thus calculated as 76.9 percent (10 of the 13 responses in the analysis).

Using 50.0 percent as the threshold and counting nonresponses as 0, as done by Kohl and Davis, the directors achieved consensus on forty-nine titles (69.0% of the 71) and the deans displayed consensus on fifty-four titles (76.1%). The degree of consensus among directors is somewhat higher than the 64.5 percent figure (20 of 31) in the original study, but consensus among deans is lower than the 87.1 percent level (27 of 31) from the first investigation.[45] When blank responses are disregarded, a method not used by Kohl and Davis, the directors' consensus increases to 98.6 percent (70 of 71) and the deans' consensus rises to 100 percent. Note that higher consensus levels are almost inevitable with the second method because there are only five possibilities rather than six.

TABLE 6
Degree of Internal Consensus by ARL Library Directors in Journal Ratings: "Not familiar" and blank responses are not considered.

Journal Title	Most Frequent Adjacent Totals[1]	Percentage of Total	Standard Deviation
College & Research Libraries	49 (4,5)	92.5	0.662
Journal of the American Society for Info. Science & Technology	44 (4,5)	91.7	0.849
Library Trends	50 (4,5)	90.9	0.836
Journal of Academic Librarianship	50 (4,5)	89.3	0.846
Library Quarterly	48 (4,5)	87.3	0.963
Library & Information Science	27 (3,4)	87.1	0.715
Reference & User Services Quarterly	43 (4,5)	82.7	0.764
Information & Management	27 (3,4)	81.8	0.795
Knowledge Organization	17 (3,4)	81.0	0.814
Information Technology & Libraries	38 (4,5)	80.9	0.798
Information Outlook	36 (3,4)	80.0	0.815
International Journal of Information Management	24 (3,4)	80.0	0.819
Journal of Information Technology	24 (3,4)	80.0	0.774
Cybermetrics	10 (3,4)	76.9	1.044
Library Resources & Technical Services	40 (4,5)	76.9	0.916
Online	30 (3,4)	76.9	0.893
Journal of Scholarly Publishing	26 (4,5)	76.5	0.965
Interlending & Document Supply	28 (3,4)	75.7	0.968
Journal of the Medical Library Association	31 (4,5)	75.6	0.989
ARIST	38 (4,5)	74.5	0.904
Library & Information Science Research	29 (4,5)	74.4	0.900
Econtent	26 (3,4)	74.3	0.910
Information Systems Research	16 (3,4)	72.7	0.869
Social Science Computer Review	16 (3,4)	72.7	0.912
Collection Management	37 (3,4)	72.5	0.874
Social Science Information	18 (3,4)	72.0	0.913
Journal of Information Science	25 (3,4)	71.4	0.868
Reference Services Review	32 (4,5)	71.1	0.863
Internet Research	17 (3,4)	70.8	0.897
Libraries & Culture	26 (3,4)	70.3	0.843
Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services	35 (4,5)	70.0	1.069
The Information Society	16 (3,4)	69.6	1.037
MIS Quarterly	16 (2,3)	69.6	1.180

TABLE 6
Degree of Internal Consensus by ARL Library Directors in Journal Ratings: "Not familiar" and blank responses are not considered.

Journal Title	Most Frequent Adjacent Totals[1]	Percentage of Total	Standard Deviation
Journal of Government Information	27 (3,4)	69.2	0.935
Journal of Management Information Systems	20 (3,4)	69.0	0.942
Journal of Librarianship & Information Science	24 (3,4)	68.6	0.919
Telecommunications Policy	15 (3,4)	68.2	1.020
Information Research	17 (3,4)	68.0	0.963
International Journal of Legal Information	17 (3,4)	68.0	1.030
Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association	17 (4,5)	68.0	0.987
Journal of Documentation	27 (3,4)	67.5	0.958
Microform & Imaging Review	27 (3,4)	67.5	0.934
Information Systems Journal	14 (3,4)	66.7	0.978
Journal of Health Communication	12 (3,4)	66.7	0.984
Law Library Journal	22 (3,4)	66.7	0.951
Canadian Journal of Information & Library Science	23 (3,4)	65.7	1.114
Aslib Proceedings	30 (3,4)	65.2	1.069
Program: Electronic Library & Information Systems	11 (2,3)	64.7	1.029
Scientometrics	10 (3,4)	62.5	1.223
Online Information Review	19 (2,3)	61.3	1.048
ASIST Proceedings	22 (3,4)	61.1	1.162
International Journal of Geographical Information Science	14 (3,4)	60.9	1.020
International Information & Library Review	15 (3,4)	60.0	1.122
Government Information Quarterly	28 (3,4)	59.6	1.065
Journal of Education for Library & Information Science	25 (3,4)	59.5	1.173
School Library Journal	24 (1,2)	58.5	1.101
Libri	25 (3,4)	58.1	1.081
Electronic Library	15 (3,4)	57.7	1.211
School Library Media Research	19 (1,2)	57.6	1.242
First Monday	16 (3,4)	57.1	1.228
Public Libraries	21 (1,2)	56.8	1.262
Information Processing & Management	15 (3,4)	55.6	1.074

TABLE 6
Degree of Internal Consensus by ARL Library Directors in Journal Ratings: "Not familiar" and blank responses are not considered.

Journal Title	Most Frequent Adjacent Totals[1]	Percentage of Total	Standard Deviation
Library Journal	31 (4,5)	55.4	1.216
NFD Information—Wissenschaft und Praxis	6 (1,2)	54.5	1.191
Harvard Library Bulletin	20 (3,4)	54.1	1.221
D-Lib Magazine	24 (3,4)	53.3	1.248
Restaurator	9 (4,5)	52.9	1.551
American Libraries	29 (2,3)	52.7	1.203
Zeitschrift fur Bibliothekswesen und Bibliographie	11 (4,5)	52.4	1.411
Journal of Information Ethics	14 (3,4)	50.0	1.138
Scientist	14 (4,5)	45.2	1.159

[1]The number of responses in the two adjacent rating categories (1 through 5) receiving the highest number of ratings with the two categories indicated in parentheses

Comparison of Ratings and Rankings with Original Kohl–Davis Study

For the purpose of this analysis, a changed title is still considered the same journal. Thus, *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* is the equivalent of *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* and *Reference & Users Services Quarterly* is the same title as *RQ*. Less obviously, *Information Outlook* is considered the successor to *Special Libraries*.

With nonresponses rated 0, there is a strong .864 correlation between the directors' ratings here and in Kohl–Davis for the set of twenty-five titles covered in both; the correlation for the deans' ratings is .781. These correlations suggest considerable stability in both groups' perception of journals over the past twenty years. It is questionable whether one could make a valid comparison between the ratings in table 2, calculated by disregarding nonrating responses, and the Kohl–Davis study because they did not use that method.

Table 9 lists the ten most highly rated journals by directors and then by deans in Kohl–Davis and their positions in this study.[46] There is a remarkable consistency in the directors' perceptions of the top journals over the past two decades. *College & Research Libraries*, first in 1985, continues in first place and eight of the top ten in 1985 remain in the top ten according to both methods of calculating the mean rating.

Compared to the directors, there is less overlap in the deans' perceptions of the top ten journals between 1985 and now. Although *Library Quarterly* and *JASIST* continue to occupy the top two positions (but in a different order), only two of their 3rd through 10th choices in 1985 (*Library Trends* and *Library & Information Science Research*) remain in the top ten. However, changes in the composition of the list to be rated may be an explanatory factor. *Drexel Library Quarterly*, ranked 7th in 1985, has ceased publication and several titles in the deans' top ten in this study were, for a variety of reasons, not included in Kohl–Davis (e.g., *ARIST*, *ASIST Proceedings*, and *Journal of Documentation* in table 1 and *Journal of Documentation*, *ARIST*, *Scientometrics*, *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, and *MIS Quarterly* in table 2).

TABLE 7
Degree of Internal Consensus by LIS Deans in Journal Ratings: "Not familiar" and blank responses are counted as 0.

Journal Title	Top Adjacent Totals[1]	Percentage of Total	Standard Deviation
Journal of the American Society for Info. Science & Technology	33 (4,5)	89.2	1.423
Library Quarterly	33 (4,5)	89.2	1.166
NFD Information—Wissenschaft und Praxis	32 (0,1)	86.5	0.956
Cybermetrics	31 (0,1)	83.8	1.301
American Libraries	29 (1,2)	78.4	0.947
International Journal of Geographical Information Science	29 (0,1)	78.4	1.377
Library & Information Science Research	28 (4,5)	75.7	1.500
Restaurator	28 (0,1)	75.7	1.114
ARIST	27 (4,5)	73.0	1.258
Journal of Documentation	27 (4,5)	73.0	1.488
Reference & User Services Quarterly	27 (3,4)	73.0	1.214
Scientist	27 (0,1)	73.0	1.430
Social Science Computer Review	27 (0,1)	73.0	1.475
Zeitschrift fur Bibliothekswesen und Bibliographie	26 (0,1)	70.3	1.813
ASIST Proceedings	25 (3,4)	67.6	1.095
Online Information Review	25 (2,3)	67.6	1.234
Telecommunications Policy	25 (0,1)	67.6	1.924
Information Processing & Management	24 (4,5)	64.9	1.880
Journal of Academic Librarianship	24 (3,4)	64.9	1.325
Library Trends	24 (4,5)	64.9	1.552
Online	24 (2,3)	64.9	1.373
Aslib Proceedings	23 (3,4)	62.2	1.357
Information Technology & Libraries	23 (2,3)	62.2	1.334
Journal of Information Science	23 (3,4)	62.2	1.615
Journal of Scholarly Publishing	23 (3,4)	62.2	1.742
Social Science Information	23 (0,1)	62.2	1.647
Econtent	22 (0,1)	59.5	1.367
Information Outlook	22 (2,3)	59.5	1.238
Interlending & Document Supply	22 (0,1)	59.5	1.351
International Journal of Legal Information	22 (0,1)	59.5	1.701
Journal of Education for Library & Information Science	22 (3,4)	59.5	1.288
Journal of the Medical Library Association	22 (3,4)	59.5	1.525

TABLE 7
Degree of Internal Consensus by LIS Deans in Journal Ratings: "Not familiar" and blank responses are counted as 0.

Journal Title	Top Adjacent Totals[1]	Percentage of Total	Standard Deviation
Libraries & Culture	22 (4,5)	59.5	1.706
Library Journal	22 (1,2)	59.5	1.244
Library Resources & Technical Services	22 (4,5)	59.5	1.646
Public Libraries	22 (2,3)	59.5	1.351
Reference Services Review	22 (2,3)	59.5	1.441
Canadian Journal of Information & Library Science	21 (3,4)	56.8	1.367
Information Systems Journal	21 (0,1)	56.8	1.592
Libri	21 (3,4)	56.8	1.413
Program: Electronic Library & Information Systems	21 (0,1)	56.8	1.726
School Library Journal	21 (3,4)	56.8	1.330
School Library Media Research	21 (3,4)	56.8	1.656
College & Research Libraries	20 (4,5)	54.1	1.481
D-Lib Magazine	20 (0,1)	54.1	1.573
Electronic Library	20 (0,1)	54.1	1.415
Government Information Quarterly	20 (3,4)	54.1	1.492
Microform & Imaging Review	20 (2,3)	54.1	1.324
MIS Quarterly	20 (0,1)	54.1	2.070
Scientometrics	20 (0,1)	54.1	2.192
Information Systems Research	19 (0,1)	51.4	1.951
Journal of Government Information	19 (3,4)	51.4	1.552
Journal of Health Communication	19 (0,1)	51.4	1.722
Harvard Library Bulletin	19 (0,1)	51.4	1.216
First Monday	18 (0,1)	48.6	1.605
Journal of Information Technology	18 (0,1)	48.6	1.813
Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association	18 (4,5)	48.6	1.906
Knowledge Organization	18 (0,1)	48.6	1.888
Law Library Journal	18 (3,4)	48.6	1.622
Library & Information Science	18 (3,4)	48.6	1.747
Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services	18 (3,4)	48.6	1.722
Collection Management	17 (2,3)	45.9	1.573
Information Research	17 (4,5)	45.9	1.942
International Information & Library Review	17 (0,1)	45.9	1.614

TABLE 7
Degree of Internal Consensus by LIS Deans in Journal Ratings: "Not familiar" and blank responses are counted as 0.

Journal Title	Top Adjacent Totals[1]	Percentage of Total	Standard Deviation
International Journal of Information Management	17 (3,4)	45.9	1.745
Journal of Information Ethics	17 (2,3)	45.9	1.702
Journal of Librarianship & Information Science	17 (3,4)	45.9	1.739
The Information Society	16 (3,4)	43.2	1.946
Internet Research	16 (3,4)	43.2	1.669
Journal of Management Information Systems	16 (0,1)	43.2	1.900
Information & Management	15 (0,1)	40.5	1.712

[1]The number of responses in the two adjacent rating categories (0 through 5) receiving the highest number of ratings with the two categories indicated in parentheses

The Top Five Method

Following White's methodology for evaluating LIS education programs,[47] Kohl and Davis noted that the unordered "top five" technique forces respondents into "extreme choices," which, unlike an ordinal scale, are not influenced by secondary or tertiary ratings.[48] They believed this approach might be unreliable when consensus falls below 40 percent, but that it "works well when there is a strong consensus." Table 10 lists the directors' top five choices and table 11 the titles named by deans as among the top five.

Thirty-nine titles were listed by directors, topped by *College & Research Libraries*, which ranked first in both tables 1 and 2. The directors' top four picks in table 10 are the top four in table 1 (but in different order) and account for three of the top four in table 2. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, which tied for fifth in table 10, was not on the original list.

The deans listed thirty-one different titles, headed by the *JASIST* and then *Library Quarterly*. These two journals tied for first in table 1 and ranked first and second in table 2. Indeed, of the deans' top five choices in table 11, four ranked among the top five in both tables 1 and 2; none placed lower than 7th in either table.

Although more titles are listed here as top five candidates than in the original Kohl–Davis study (where deans listed 21 journals and directors 18), there is remarkable continuity in the directors' choices. *College & Research Libraries* was also their first choice in 1985, and their four most frequently mentioned titles were the same as in this study, although the precise order differs. There is less continuity in the deans' selections. In 1985, *Library Quarterly was* their most frequent choice, followed by *JASIS*, an order that is reversed here. (For this study's purposes, *JASIST* is the equivalent of *JASIS*.) The deans' next three top five selections from 1985 (*College & Research Libraries*, *Library Trends*, and *Journal of Education for Librarianship*) were 8th, 7th, and 9th (tied), respectively, in this investigation.[49]

In summary, the overlap in the most prestigious journals according to both the mean rating and "top five" approaches in this study and the notable continuity over twenty years in the top five choices reinforce the perception of an exceedingly high-prestige status for some elite journals. As with the mean ratings, there is greater continuity in the directors' perceptions than in the deans'.

TABLE 8
Degree of Internal Consensus by LIS Deans in Journal Ratings: "Not familiar" and blank responses are not considered.

Journal Title	Top Adjacent Totals[1]	Percentage of Total	Standard Deviation
Journal of the American Society for Info. Science & Technology	33 (4,5)	94.3	0.968
Library Quarterly	33 (4,5)	91.7	0.910
Journal of Scholarly Publishing	23 (3,4)	88.5	0.706
Online	24 (2,3)	85.7	0.810
Microform & Imaging Review	20 (2,3)	83.3	0.776
American Libraries	29 (1,2)	82.9	0.867
Journal of Information Technology	17 (3,4)	81.0	1.007
Online Information Review	25 (2,3)	80.6	0.791
Information Processing & Management	24 (4,5)	80.0	0.877
Library & Information Science Research	28 (4,5)	80.0	1.183
Restaurator	8 (2,3)	80.0	0.823
Journal of Documentation	27 (4,5)	79.4	0.989
Reference Services Review	23 (3,4)	79.3	0.778
Library & Information Science	18 (3,4)	78.3	0.822
Reference & User Services Quarterly	27 (3,4)	77.1	0.910
Program: Electronic Library & Information Systems	13 (3,4)	76.5	0.951
ARIST	27 (4,5)	75.0	1.079
Information Systems Journal	12(2,3)	75.0	0.929
Knowledge Organization	15 (3,4)	75.0	0.999
Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services	18 (3,4)	75.0	0.932
Journal of Information Science	23 (3,4)	74.2	1.029
Information Systems Research	14 (3,4)	73.7	1.017
The Information Society	16 (3,4)	72.7	1.008
Internet Research	16 (3,4)	72.7	0.976
Scientometrics	13 (4,5)	72.2	1.110
Information Technology & Libraries	23 (2,3)	71.9	0.856
Journal of Management Information Systems	15 (2,3)	71.4	0.928
NFD Information—Wissenschaft und Praxis	5 (1,2)	71.4	1.069
Library Resources & Technical Services	22 (4,5)	71.0	0.973
International Journal of Legal Information	12 (3,4)	70.6	1.111
Library Trends	24 (4,5)	70.6	1.153
Electronic Library	14 (2,3)	70.0	0.945
Aslib Proceedings	23 (3,4)	69.7	0.992

TABLE 8
Degree of Internal Consensus by LIS Deans in Journal Ratings: "Not familiar" and blank responses are not considered.

Journal Title	Top Adjacent Totals[1]	Percentage of Total	Standard Deviation
ASIST Proceedings	25 (3,4)	69.4	0.939
Libraries & Culture	22 (4,5)	68.8	1.191
Journal of Academic Librarianship	24 (3,4)	68.6	1.051
Interlending & Document Supply	13 (2,3)	68.4	0.946
International Journal of Information Management	17 (3,4)	68.0	1.130
School Library Media Research	21 (3,4)	67.7	1.013
Information Outlook	22 (2,3)	66.7	0.936
Journal of the Medical Library Association	22 (3,4)	66.7	1.091
MIS Quarterly	12 (4,5)	66.7	1.043
Public Libraries	22 (2,3)	66.7	1.015
Scientist	8 (3,4)	66.7	1.055
Journal of Government Information	19 (3,4)	65.5	1.017
Harvard Library Bulletin	17 (2,3)	65.4	0.891
Journal of Information Ethics	17 (2,3)	65.4	1.148
International Information & Library Review	15 (2,3)	65.2	1.137
Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association	18 (4,5)	64.3	1.044
Law Library Journal	18 (3,4)	64.3	1.008
Social Science Information	9 (3,4)	64.3	0.949
Canadian Journal of Information & Library Science	21 (3,4)	63.6	1.029
Social Science Computer Review	7 (2,3)	63.6	1.136
D-Lib Magazine	12 (3,4)	63.2	0.976
Information Research	17 (4,5)	63.0	1.171
Journal of Librarianship & Information Science	17 (3,4)	63.0	1.068
Library Journal	22 (1,2)	62.9	1.157
Government Information Quarterly	20 (3,4)	62.5	1.118
Libri	21 (3,4)	61.8	1.149
Journal of Education for Library & Information Science	22 (3,4)	61.1	1.178
Information & Management	14 (2,3)	60.9	1.065
Collection Management	17 (2,3)	60.7	1.113
Journal of Health Communication	12 (2,3)	60.0	1.217
School Library Journal	21 (3,4)	60.0	1.175

TABLE 8
Degree of Internal Consensus by LIS Deans in Journal Ratings: "Not familiar" and blank responses are not considered.

Journal Title	Top Adjacent Totals[1]	Percentage of Total	Standard Deviation
First Monday	13 (2,3)	59.1	1.120
College & Research Libraries	20 (4,5)	58.8	1.115
International Journal of Geographical Information Science	7 (1,2)	58.3	1.379
Zeitschrift fur Bibliothekswesen und Bibliographie	7 (4,5)	58.3	1.314
Econtent	12 (2,3)	57.1	1.044
Telecommunications Policy	7 (4,5)	53.8	1.387
Cybermetrics	4 (3,4)	50.0	1.389

[1]The number of responses in the two adjacent rating categories (1 through 5) receiving the highest number of ratings with the two categories indicated in parentheses

Additionally Suggested Journals

Additional titles suggested by respondents that were not on the original list of seventy-one to be rated are tabulated in tables 12 (by directors) and 13 (by deans). The titles were verified through *Ulrich's Periodicals Directory*, Google, or contacting the Indiana University Libraries Reference Department, because a few respondents listed them incorrectly. The ARL directors proposed forty-two additional titles, but their list was highly skewed toward two titles: *Portal: Libraries & the Academy*, mentioned by twenty-two directors, and *Libres*, named by eighteen, suggesting these two journals should have been considered for inclusion on the original list. Seven directors named the *Journal of Library Administration*, and six directors named *Educause Review* and *Library Hi-Tech*. The table does not include two titles mentioned by directors, *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* and *The Information Society*, which actually did appear on the original list.

In contrast to the directors, there is a remarkably even distribution among the thirty-nine additional titles suggested by the deans as only four were named more than twice. *American Archivist* was mentioned by four deans, and *Archival Science*, *Archivaria*, and *Information Retrieval* were each named by three deans. It is noteworthy that most of these titles focus on archival science. Ten titles were proposed by two different deans, and twenty-five were listed only once.

In the Kohl–Davis study, LIS deans suggested fifteen additional titles and ARL directors suggested only ten, leading them to conclude, "our choice of core library journals was confirmed."[50] The larger number of additional titles suggested here, even though the titles on the list for rating more than doubled in size from thirty-one to seventy-one, calls into question whether a single core list for the LIS field exists.

Open-ended Responses

Fifteen deans and thirteen directors wrote comments in response to the questionnaire's open-ended section. The most prevalent theme concerned the importance of non-LIS journals. Specific comments from various deans included: "Titles from other disciplines are important for faculty from those disciplines"; "The nature of LIS research is such that any listing of LIS journals will not catch the outlyers [sic]"; "Because our faculty is multidisciplinary, we also look favorably

TABLE 9
Top Ten Journals in Kohl-Davis and Their Current Ranking

ARL Directors		
Rank and Title	**Table 1 (NFs & blank responses = 0)**	**Table 2 (NFs & blank responses disregarded)**
1. College & Research Libraries	1	1
2. Library Quarterly	4	6
3. Journal of Academic Librarianship	3	4
4. Library Resources & Technical Services	6	8*
5. Library Trends	2	2
6. Information Technology & Libraries	10	7
7. JASIS	7**	3**
8. Library Journal	11*	45
9. American Libraries	18	66
10. RQ	5***	5***

*Tied position
** Under present title, Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology
***Under present title, Reference & User Services Quarterly

LIS Deans		
Rank and Title	**Table 1 (NFs & blank responses = 0)**	**Table 2 (NFs & blank responses disregarded)**
1. Library Quarterly	1*	2
2. JASIS	1* **	1**
3. College & Research Libraries	11	12*
4. Library Trends	6	8
5. Journal of Education for Librarianship	12***	28***
6. Library Resources & Technical Services	15	12*
7. Drexel Library Quarterly	NR	NR
8. Special Libraries	28****	55****
9. Information Technology & Libraries	25*	40*
10. Library & Info. Science Research	3*	4

NR: Not included in rating because title ceased publication
*Tied position
**Under present title, Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology
***Under present title, Journal of Education for Library & Information Science
****Under present title, Information Outlook

on major research journals from related fields such as communication and policy studies"; and "'Peer-reviewed' journals are important in the T & P process whether they are directly in LIS or in a cognate field." A number of directors made similar observations, such as: "Our librarians publish in nonlibrary journals"; "Tenure criteria are broader than LIS-type publications"; and "P & T is not limited these days to LIS journals." Education, higher education, instructional technology,

TABLE 10
Journals Listed among the Top Five Most Prestigious by ARL Directors

Journal Title	Number of Times Listed	Percentage of the 56 Directors Who Listed It
College & Research Libraries	40	71.4
Journal of Academic Librarianship	27	48.2
Library Trends	26	46.4
Library Quarterly	17	30.4
Portal: Libraries and the Academy	14	25.0
Journal of the American Society for Info. Science & Technology	14	25.0
Reference & User Services Quarterly	13	23.2
Library Resources & Technical Services	10	17.9
D-Lib Magazine	8	14.3
Annual Review of Information Science & Technology	7	12.5
Information Technology & Libraries	7	12.5
Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services	7	12.5
Library Journal	6	10.7
Educause Review	3	5.4
Journal of the Medical Library Association	3	5.4
Reference Services Review	3	5.4
Collection Management	2	3.6
First Monday	2	3.6
Journal of Documentation	2	3.6
Journal of Information Science	2	3.6
MIS Quarterly[1]	2	3.6
ASIST Proceedings	2	3.6
American Libraries	1	1.8
Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science	1	1.8
Chronicle of Higher Education	1	1.8
College & Research Libraries News	1	1.8
Cybermetrics	1	1.8
Government Information Quarterly	1	1.8
Harvard Library Bulletin	1	1.8
Information Processing & Management	1	1.8
International Journal of Geographical Information Science	1	1.8
Journal of Scholarly Publishing	1	1.8

TABLE 10
Journals Listed among the Top Five Most Prestigious by ARL Directors

Journal Title	Number of Times Listed	Percentage of the 56 Directors Who Listed It
Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association	1	1.8
Journal of Education for Library & Information Science	1	1.8
Journal of Information Technology	1	1.8
Journal of Librarianship & Information Science	1	1.8
Library & Information Science Research	1	1.8
Libri	1	1.8
Serials Librarian	1	1.8
[1]Listed as Management Information Quarterly		

computer science, bioinformatics, operations research, communications studies, sociology, and history were specifically mentioned as fields whose journals could be important.

One dean wrote, "An essential problem here is the diversity of our field… the fractured nature of the discourse functionally means that there are few reputable journals publishing across the field" and a director stated "[It is] very hard to rate such different sorts of journals on one common scale." Other points included the significance of peer-reviewed journals, the influence of a candidate's specialty area on the relative importance of the journals in his or her case, and the fact that factors other than journal quality are considered. Some respondents mentioned various journal categories they believed were omitted from or underrepresented on the initial list (e.g., archival science, Haworth Press publications, and all-electronic journals). A few noted that their institutions did not have a "stated policy" or "prescribed list" regarding journals in the promotion and tenure process.

Thirteen directors responded but declined to complete the questionnaire, citing reasons such as institutional policy against completing surveys, their library does not collect LIS literature, lack of knowledge about the journals, the concept of prestige is "ambiguous," and (the most frequently stated reason) their institution does not have a promotion and tenure policy. One nonresponding director wrote that the same list could not be used for both promotion and tenure and journal collection management decisions—a potentially debatable point.

One director stated, "I want many of these journals [on our list] to cease publication. They simply should not exist." And a dean exclaimed, "No stamp? You got my time and my 37 cents—you lucked out" (return postage was not included because institutional support for mailing was assumed), thus demonstrating there are some curmudgeons in both groups.

Correspondence between Perception Ratings and Citation Data

To explore the relationship between the perceptions of journals and citation data, this study's mean ratings were correlated with the journals' citation scores from the 2001 *Journal Citations Reports* (the most current version when the project was designed during the first half of 2003). Table 14, displaying the set of eight correlations, shows moderate positive cor-

TABLE 11
Journals Listed among the Top Five Most Prestigious by LIS Deans

Journal Title	Number of Times Listed	Percentage of the 37 Deans Who Listed It
Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology	29	78.4
Library Quarterly	25	67.6
Library & Information Science Research	14	37.8
Annual Review of Information Science & Technology	12	32.4
Information Processing & Management	11	29.7
Journal of Documentation	9	24.3
Library Trends	8	21.6
College & Research Libraries	6	16.2
Journal of Education for Library & Information Science	5	13.5
Libraries & Culture	5	13.5
ACM Transactions on Information Systems	3	8.1
Reference & User Services Quarterly	3	8.1
American Archivist	2	5.4
Canadian Journal of Information & Library Science	2	5.4
Journal of Management Information Systems	2	5.4
Journal of the Medical Library Association	2	5.4
Management Information Quarterly	2	5.4
ASIST Proceedings	2	5.4
Archival Science	1	2.7
Government Information Quarterly	1	2.7
Information Research	1	2.7
Information Retrieval	1	2.7
Journal of Academic Librarianship	1	2.7
Journal of American Libraries[1]	1	2.7
Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association	1	2.7
Journal of Health Communication	1	2.7
Journal of Information Science	1	2.7
Journal of Librarianship & Information Science	1	2.7
School Library Media Research	1	2.7
Scientometrics	1	2.7
Telecommunications Policy	1	2.7

[1]Unverified title

TABLE 12
Additional Titles Suggested by ARL Directors

Journal Title	Number of Times Suggested
Portal: Libraries & the Academy	22
Libres	18
Journal of Library Administration	7
Educause Review	6
Library Hi-Tech	6
Cataloging & Classification Quarterly	5
Serials Librarian	4
Against the Grain	3
Charlotte Advisor	3
International Fed. of Library Assoc. & Institutions Proceedings	3
Research Strategies	3
American Archivist	2
Acquisitions Librarian	2
Chronicle of Higher Education	2
Educause Quarterly	2
Journal of Internet Cataloging	2
Library Administration & Management Journal	2
Library Technology Reports	2
Reference Librarian	2
Serials Review	2
Advances in Library Administration & Organization	1
Association of Research Libraries Newsletter	1
Bottom Line, The	1
Choice	1
College & Research Libraries News	1
Colorado Libraries	1
Computers in Libraries	1
Cybernetrics & Human Knowing	1
Data Mining & Knowledge Discovery	1
Human Computer Interaction	1
Institute of E & E Engineers Transactions on Info Theory	1
International Journal of Educational Technology	1
International Journal of Human-Computer Studies	1
International Journal of Medical Informatics	1
Inspel[1]	1
Issues in Science & Technology Librarianship	1

TABLE 12
Additional Titles Suggested by ARL Directors

Journal Title	Number of Times Suggested
Journal of Access Services	1
Journal of Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarianship	1
Journal of Data Mining & Knowledge Discovery[2]	1
Library Acquisitions, Practices & Theory[3]	1
Science & Technology Libraries	1
Technical Services Quarterly	1

[1]Listed as International Journal of Special Libraries
[2]Listed as Data Mining & Knowledge Discovery
[3]The current title, Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services, is on the list of 71 for rating.

relations of the deans' mean ratings with impact factor (.528) and of their ratings with total citations (.479), when blank responses are disregarded. In contrast, the correlations drop precipitously when blank responses are counted as 0 to .304 for impact factor and .254 for total citations. It is striking that the correlations between the directors' ratings and citation data range from weak (.267) to practically nonexistent (.038).

The correlations in table 14 are higher when blank responses are disregarded rather than counted as 0, suggesting the former may be a more valid measure of calculating the mean rating score. There may be a variety of reasons why the deans' ratings have a moderate association with the *JCR* citation measures and the ARL library directors' do not. It is probable that *JCR* citation data measure a journal's contribution to research to a greater extent than its usefulness for professional practice, whereas deans placed a greater emphasis in their ratings on the former and directors the latter. Deans may be familiar with a broader range of journals and may have more accurately estimated the quality of information science and nonacademic library science journals. Indeed, the fact that deans tended to give higher ratings to information science journals that have high citation scores is undoubtedly an important factor. A complete explanation for this phenomenon is not readily apparent and requires further research beyond this article's scope.

Although most journal rankings do not analyze the correlation between perception and citation data, a few such reports for other disciplines are available in the literature. Christenson and Sigelman[51] found that *JCR* impact factor scores displayed a .526 correlation with Glenn's[52] perception rating of sociology journals and a .572 correlation with Giles and Wright's[53] perception study of political science journals. Nisonger's[54] ranking of political science journals based on manipulation of *JCR* impact factor had a .71 correlation with Giles, Mizell, and Patterson's[55] perception ranking and a .59 correlation with Garand's[56] ranking, which combined mean perception ratings with the proportion of respondents rating the journal.

Conclusions

Although a new citation ranking of LIS journals is available each year through the *Journal Citation Reports,* this replication of the Kohl–Davis[57] study offers a current perception-based ranking, updating Blake's[58] 1996 ranking, which used data gathered in 1992. This study, like its predecessors, has demonstrated that a hierarchy of prestige among LIS journals does indeed exist, but the hierarchical order differs somewhat between the two constituencies. There is notable continu-

TABLE 13
Additional Titles Suggested by LIS Deans

Journal Title	Number of Times Suggested
American Archivist	4
Archival Science	3
Archivaria	3
Information Retrieval	3
ACM Transactions on Information Systems	2
Behaviour & Information Technology	2
Bookbird	2
Education for Information	2
International Journal of Human–Computer Studies	2
Journal of Library Administration	2
Journal of Youth Services[1]	2
Portal: Libraries & the Academy	2
School Libraries Worldwide	2
World Libraries[2]	2
ACM Communications	1
ACM Transactions on Computer–Human Interaction	1
Archival Issues	1
Arges	1
Bulletin de bibliothèques de France	1
Documentaliste-Sciences de l'Information[3]	1
Documentation et bibliothèques	1
Harvard Business Review	1
Human Factors	1
Information et Documentation	1
Inspel	1
Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers Network	1
KM World	1
Knowledge Management Review[4]	1
Knowledge Quest	1
Library, The	1
MIT Sloan Management Review[5]	1
Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America	1
Papers of the Bibliographical Society of Canada	1
RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts & Cultural Heritage[6]	1
RLG DigiNews[7]	1
Serials Review	1

TABLE 13
Additional Titles Suggested by LIS Deans

Journal Title	Number of Times Suggested
Signal	1
Sloan Management	1
Voice of Young Advocates	1
(Vague or illegible responses)	3

[1]Listed once as Journal of Youth Services
[2]Listed once under previous title Third World Libraries
[3]Listed as Documentaliste
[4]Listed as KM Review
[5]Listed as Sloan Management
[6]Listed as Rare Books and Manuscripts
[7]Listed as DigiNews

ity in the perception of LIS journals over a twenty-year period, but more so in the directors' perceptions than in the deans'. The most elite journals in the 1980s maintain the highest status positions (e.g., *JASIS* (now *JASIST*), *Library Quarterly*, and *College & Research Libraries*).

The authors' findings suggest (but do not prove) that the composition of LIS as a discipline is changing. As noted above, several respondents questioned whether a single list of journals could represent the LIS field, given its increasingly diverse, interdisciplinary, and even multidisciplinary nature. This contention is supported by the fact that the number of journals listed among the "top five" and as additions to the list for rating is much higher now than twenty years ago.

Some caveats regarding the use and interpretation of these findings are in order. Journal value is multifaceted, so that a low-ranking journal in this study may still be important for supporting teaching, professional practice, a specialty area, or some other purpose. Although a journal rating has potential use for journal collection management decisions in libraries and university promotion and tenure decisions, the perception of a journal's prestige is simply one bit of information that should be used cautiously in conjunction with other indicators, such as the publisher's reputation, rejection rate, indexing coverage, editorial board membership, status of authors contributing to the journal, and so on. The journal's relevance

TABLE 14
Pearson Correlations between Perception Ratings and 2001 JCR Citation Data

Variables	Correlation
Deans' rating (NFs & blanks disregarded) and total citations	.479
Deans' rating (NFs & blanks disregarded) and impact factor	.528
Deans' rating (NFs & blanks counted as 0) and total citations	.254
Deans' rating (NFs & blanks counted as 0) and impact factor	.304
Directors' rating (NFs & blanks disregarded) and total citations	.208
Directors' rating (NFs & blanks disregarded) and impact factor	.267
Directors' rating (NFs & blanks counted as 0) and total citations	.038
Directors' rating (NFs & blanks counted as 0) and impact factor	.086

to the candidate's specialty would be important in promotion and tenure decisions, whereas cost, usage, and collecting priorities would be additional factors in libraries' journal decision-making. This caveat would, of course, apply to citation data as well. As stated by Kohl and Davis, "the prestige of a journal is only an indication, not a guarantee of the quality of its articles."[59]

Finally it is unclear how recent trends or developments, such as the movement toward open-access or full-text databases, are currently affecting journal perceptions or might affect them in the future.

Notes

1. David F. Kohl and Charles H. Davis, "Ratings of Journals by ARL Library Directors and Deans of Library and Information Science Schools," *College & Research Libraries* 46 (Jan. 1985): 40–47.
2. Virgil L. P. Blake, "The Perceived Prestige of Professional Journals, 1995: A Replication of the Kohl–Davis Study," *Education for Information* 14 (Oct. 1996): 157–79.
3. Thomas E. Nisonger, *Management of Serials in Libraries* (Englewood, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1998), 201.
4. ———, "*JASIS* and Library and Information Science Journal Rankings: A Review and Analysis of the Last Half Century," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 50 (Sept. 1999): 1004–19.
5. Alice I. Bryan, *The Public Librarian* (New York: Columbia University Pr., 1952).
6. Mary Lee Bundy, "Public Library Administrators View Their Professional Periodicals," *Illinois Libraries* 43 (June 1996): 397–420.
7. C. W. Hanson and Patricia Tilbury, "Library Literature Read by ASLIB Conference Attenders," *Journal of Documentation* 19 (June 1963): 63–71.
8. Rudolf Jacob Penner, "Measuring a Library's Capability … ," *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 13 (summer 1972): 17–30.
9. Charles T. Meadow and Mary Ann Zaborowski, "Some Statistical Aspects of *JASIS* Publications," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 30 (Nov. 1979): 368–71.
10. Robert M. Hayes, "Citation Statistics as a Measure of Faculty Research Productivity," *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 23 (winter 1983): 151–72.
11 Herbert S. White, "Perceptions by Educators and Administrators of the Ranking of Library School Programs," *College & Research Libraries* 42 (May 1981): 191–202.
12. ———, "Perceptions by Educators and Administrators of the Ranking of Library School Programs: An Update and Analysis," *Library Quarterly* 57 (July 1987): 252–68.
13. ———, "Rankings of Library and Information Science Faculty and Programs: The Third in a Series of Studies Undertaken at Six-year Intervals," *Library Quarterly* 63 (Apr. 1993): 166–88.
14. Kohl and Davis, "Ratings of Journals by ARL Library Directors and Deans," 41.
15. Jesse H. Shera, *Introduction to Library Science* (Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1976).
16. Kohl and Davis, "Ratings of Journals by ARL Library Directors and Deans," 45.
17. Renee Tjoumas, "Professional Journal Utilization by Public Library Directors," *Serials Librarian* 20, nos. 2/3 (1991): 1–16.
18. Blake, "In the Eyes of the Beholder: Perceptions of Professional Journals by Library/Information Science Educators and District School Library Media Center Coordinators," *Collection Management* 14, nos. 3/4 (1991): 101–48.
19. Renee Tjoumas and Virgil L. P. Blake, "Faculty Perceptions of the Professional Journal Literature: Quo Vadis?" *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science* 33 (summer 1992): 173–94.
20. Blake, "The Perceived Prestige of Professional Journals."
21. E. E. Nkereuwem, "Accrediting Knowledge: The Ranking of Library and Information Science Journals," *Library Review* 46, no. 2 (1997): 99–104 and *Asian Libraries* 6, nos. 1/2 (1997): 71–76.
22. Michael W. Giles, Francie Mizell, and David Patterson, "Political Scientists' Journal Evaluations Revisited," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 22 (Sept. 1989): 613–17.
23. Norval D. Glenn, "American Sociologists' Evaluations of Sixty-three Journals," *American Sociologist* 6 (Nov. 1971): 298–303.
24. David Lee and Arthur Evans, "American Geographers' Rankings of American Geography Journals," *Professional Geographer* 36 (Aug. 1984): 292–300.

25. David Shichor, Robert M. O'Brien, and David L. Decker, "Prestige of Journals in Criminology and Criminal Justice," *Criminology* 19 (Nov. 1981): 461–69.
26. J. Craig Peery and Gerald R. Adams, "Qualitative Ratings of Human Development Journals," *Human Development* 24, no. 5 (1981): 312–19.
27. Jean-Louis Malouin and J.-Francois Outreville, "The Relative Impact of Economics Journals—A Cross Country Survey and Comparison," *Journal of Economics and Business* 39 (Aug. 1987): 267–77.
28. Marian M. Extejt and Jonathan E. Smith, "The Behavioral Sciences and Management: An Evaluation of Relevant Journals," *Journal of Management* 16 (Sept. 1990): 539–51.
29. Robert H. Luke and E. Reed Doke, "Marketing Journal Hierarchies: Faculty Perceptions, 1986–87," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 15 (spring 1987): 74–78.
30. Joe Albert and P. R. Chandy, "Research and Publishing in Real Estate," *Akron Business & Economics Review* 17 (winter 1986): 46–54.
31. Andrew C. Wicks and Robbin Derry, "An Evaluation of Journal Quality: The Perspective of Business Ethics Researchers," *Business Ethics Quarterly* 6 (July 1996): 359–72.
32. Lawrence D. Brown and Ronald J. Huefner, "The Familiarity with and Perceived Quality of Accounting Journals: Views of Senior Accounting Faculty in Leading U.S. MBA Programs," *Contemporary Accounting Research* 11 (summer 1994): 223–50.
33. Ram A. Cnaan, Richard K. Caputo, and Yochi Shmuely, "Senior Faculty Perceptions of Social Work Journals," *Journal of Social Work Education* 30 (spring/summer 1994): 185–99.
34. In order to protect respondent confidentiality, as required by the Indiana University Human Subjects Committee, returned questionnaires were removed from the envelopes and filed so that it was impossible to associate a completed questionnaire with a particular individual. However, for the second mailing it was possible to estimate nonrespondents to the initial mailing based on postmarks on the returning envelopes.
35. Kohl and Davis, "Ratings of Journals by ARL Library Directors and Deans," 41.
36. Blake, "The Perceived Prestige of Professional Journals," 160–61.
37. Bundy, "Public Library Administrators View Their Professional Periodicals," 398.
38. Hanson and Tilbury, "Library Literature Read by ASLIB Conference Attenders," 64.
39. Cnaan, Caputo, and Shmuely, "Senior Faculty Perceptions of Social Work Journals," 188.
40. Brown and Huefner, "The Familiarity with and Perceived Quality of Accounting Journals," 227.
41. Wicks and Derry, "An Evaluation of Journal Quality," 363.
42. The authors are aware that statistical purists maintain that t-tests should not be used for ordinal data and for descriptive rather than inferential statistics. In reality, t-tests are commonly applied to these types of data, and we have used them here for the sake of continuity with the original Kohl–Davis study and its replications.
43. Kohl and Davis, "Ratings of Journals by ARL Library Directors and Deans," 43; percentage calculated by Nisonger and Davis.
44. Ibid., 42.
45. Ibid., 43—44; percentages calculated by Nisonger and Davis.
46. Ibid., 42.
47. White, "Perceptions by Educators and Administrators of the Ranking of Library School Programs," 194.
48. Kohl and Davis, "Ratings of Journals by ARL Library Directors and Deans," 45.
49. Ibid., 46.
50. Ibid., 45.
51. James A. Christenson and Lee Sigelman, "Accrediting Knowledge: Journal Stature and Citation Impact in Social Science," *Social Science Quarterly* 66 (Dec. 1985): 964–75.
52. Glenn, "American Sociologists' Evaluations of Sixty-Three Journals."
53. Michael W. Giles and Gerald C. Wright Jr., "Political Scientists' Evaluations of Sixty-Three Journals," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 8 (summer 1975): 254–56.
54. Thomas E. Nisonger, "A Ranking of Political Science Journals Based on Citation Data," *Serials Review* 19, no. 4 (1993): 7–14.
55. Giles, Mizell, and Patterson, "Political Scientists' Journal Evaluations Revisited."
56. James C. Garand, "An Alternative Interpretation of Recent Political Science Journal Evaluations," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 23 (Sept. 1990): 448–51.
57. Kohl and Davis, "Ratings of Journals by ARL Library Directors and Deans."
58. Blake, "The Perceived Prestige of Professional Journals."
59. Kohl and Davis, "Ratings of Journals by ARL Library Directors and Deans," 47.